



PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of

Marcellin ESPEILLAC, *et al.*

Appln. No.: 09/897,436

Group Art Unit: 1764

Confirmation No.: 3559

Examiner: Walter Dean GRIFFIN

Filed: July 3, 2001

Attorney Docket No.: Q65076

For: PROCEDURE AND DEVICE FOR CRACKING OF HYDROCARBONS USING TWO
SUCCESSIVE REACTION CHAMBERS

RECEIVED
APR 21 2003
GROUP 1700

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

In response to the Office Action containing a restriction requirement mailed April 2, 2003, Applicants elect, with traverse, Group I, claims 1-16, drawn to a cracking process.

Regarding the traversal, Applicants note that non-elected Group II, claims 17-28, drawn to a cracking apparatus, are an almost exact counterpart of elected process claims 1-16. Given the congruence in recitations between the two sets of claims, it is Applicants' position that the apparatus as claimed cannot be used to practice another and materially different process, such as reforming, as stated in the Action. Consequently, the two sets of claims are able to be prosecuted in one and the same patent application.

Respectfully submitted,

L. Raul Tamayo
Registration No. 47,125

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE



23373

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Date: April 18, 2003